

1  
2 DECLARATION OF [REDACTED]

3 I Reginald [REDACTED] pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, hereby  
4 declare as follows:

5 1. My name is [REDACTED] I am a U.S. citizen. I am an  
6 attorney. I reside at [REDACTED]

7 2. I have personal knowledge about the facts set forth  
8 below.

9 3. During early-Summer 1995, I spoke on various occasions  
10 to a man named Mark Alexander, with a company called On Line  
11 Communications ("On Line"). I first called Mr. Alexander as a  
12 result of conversations that I had with [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED] who I understood to have already invested with On Line,  
14 using Mr. Alexander as his salesperson.

15 4. After I spoke to Mr. Alexander, he sent me various  
16 promotional materials. I spoke to him again after receiving  
17 those materials. Mr. Alexander told me that On Line would help  
18 me acquire a license to provide two-way, or interactive, paging  
19 services. He said that paging licenses are more valuable than  
20 SMR licenses. He said that the paging licenses were the wave of  
21 the future.

22 5. On July 6, 1995, I decided to invest with On Line. I  
23 sent On Line a check for \$12,990, a true and correct copy of the  
24 receipt for this check is attached as Exhibit 1. Mr. Alexander  
25 told me that the money I was sending in would entitle me to  
26 obtain a license serving New York City. He said that, next to  
27 Los Angeles licenses, New York licenses were the most valuable

1 ones to acquire, because of the city's population. Mr. Alexander  
2 told me before I invested that there were only a few licenses  
3 left for New York City, so I must act fast in order to get one.  
4 After he received my money, he told me that I was very fortunate  
5 since I received the third-to-last license available.  
6

7 6. Mr. Alexander discussed with me the value of the license  
8 that I would be receiving. He said that I should be receiving  
9 multiple offers to acquire the license, and suggested that I  
10 lease the license rather than selling it outright. On one  
11 occasion, Mr. Alexander told me specifically that my license was  
12 worth \$30,000-\$40,000

13 7. At different times during our early-July conversations,  
14 Mr. Alexander told me that my investment in a license for New  
15 York City was risk free. At one point, Mr. Alexander told me  
16 explicitly that I was "guaranteed" to make a profit on the deal.  
17 Later in the same conversation, he said that he could get in  
18 trouble for using the word "guaranteed," but I would definitely  
19 make money.

20 8. Mr. Alexander also told me that I could expect to  
21 receive money in the very near future if I invested with On Line.  
22 In presenting the program to me in early-July 1995, he said that  
23 I should receive some money back before Christmas, 1995.

24 9. My original plan in dealing with On Line was to invest  
25 together with [REDACTED] Indeed, on one  
26 occasion, I was involved in a conference call with Mr. Alexander  
27 and Mr. Goo. Ultimately, I decided to invest separately.

28 10. In my discussions with Mr. Alexander about the value of  
acquiring paging licenses through On Line, I asked him why paging

1 companies could not get the licenses themselves. He told me that  
2 the Federal Communications Commission would not allow them to do  
3 so. According to Mr. Alexander, the paging companies should have  
4 to come to private licensees (such as myself) to obtain the  
5 licenses they need, because the FCC restricted the number of  
6 licenses they could acquire.

7  
8 11. Mr. Alexander told me after I invested that if I have a  
9 license with a particular channel serving New York City, this  
10 would be my channel and I would own it.

11 12. Prior to sending any funds to On Line, I do not recall  
12 Mr. Alexander mentioning the idea that I might have to build out  
13 a paging system if I wanted to make money from my license.

14 Indeed, I never considered building out such a system before I  
15 invested. After I invested, I called Mr. Alexander and spoke to  
16 him about how the licenses would be built out. He told me that I  
17 would not have to worry about that, because the company to whom I  
18 would be leasing my license would take care of building the  
19 system.

20 13. After I invested, Mark Alexander called on different  
21 occasions and discussed the possibility that I might acquire  
22 additional licenses. He told me in July 1995 that there were a  
23 number of licenses left for Chicago but those licenses would not  
24 be available after a few days. He called me in August 1995 and  
25 told me that he has licenses available in such cities as  
26 Washington, D.C. and Los Angeles (Mr. Alexander claimed that this  
27 Los Angeles license became available because someone had lied on  
28

1 his application). He claimed that these licenses also would no  
2 longer be available after a few days.

3 14. Mr. Alexander told me that when I receive calls from  
4 companies attempting to acquire my license, I should make sure to  
5 get the offers in writing. He also told me to provide the  
6 information to Mr. Alexander, who would explain whether the offer  
7 is from a legitimate company and whether it is high enough to  
8 accept.

9 15. Within recent weeks, I received three paging licenses  
10 as a result of On Line's services. Attached as Exhibit 2-4 are  
11 copies of these licenses; these copies are true and correct  
12 except that they do not include certain telephone numbers that  
13 are stated on the licenses. Attached as Exhibit 5 are true and  
14 correct copies of additional documents that I received together  
15 with the licenses.

16 16. During the course of my relationship with On Line, I  
17 have received various promotional literature as well as  
18 information concerning my application for licenses. Attached as  
19 Exhibit 6 are true and correct copies of many such documents.

20 17. On October 23, 1995, I received a letter from On Line.  
21 Attached as Exhibit 7 is a true and correct copy of that letter.

22 18. I have yet to receive a single offer to buy or lease my  
23 license.

24 I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing  
25 is true and correct.

26 Dated: 11/9/95

DECLARATION OF [REDACTED]

I, [REDACTED] pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, hereby declare as follows:

1. My name is [REDACTED] I am a U.S. citizen over age 18. I am a mechanical engineering consultant. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below.

3. In late August 1995, I received a cold call from a man who told me he represented On Line Communications ("On Line"). He marketed to me an investment in paging licenses. I decided not to invest at that time.

4. Approximately one to two weeks later, a man identifying himself as "Maurice" called me and told me he represented On Line. He tried to convince me to pay On Line \$60,000 for a package of licenses for cities in the midwest. He then pressured me to cut a certified check for \$60,000 right away and told me Federal Express would pick it up from my home the next day. The pressure and the hype were too much for me and I told him to forget it.

5. On Line sent me promotional materials in the mail. After reading the promotional materials, I understood that, were I to invest with On Line, I would receive licenses granting me exclusive use of the given frequencies in the areas covered by my licenses.

6. The basic pitch of On Line representatives was that as soon as I received my licenses, people would start calling me

1 offering to lease or purchase my licenses. They explained that I  
2 would receive many offers because the FCC issues a limited number  
3 of licenses for each coverage area, and no more than one license  
4 for each entity that applies. The On Line representatives warned  
5 me about cities that were sold out, or selling out fast. For  
6 example, they said that Atlanta was "about to go," with the  
7 Olympics in '96, and all. They pressured me to hurry up before  
8 everything was gone.

9 7. The On Line salespeople assured me that leasing to a  
10 paging company would yield "a pretty hefty income" --  
11 approximately \$0.50 per pager, per month, or \$1,000 to \$2,000 per  
12 month, per city.

13 8. The On Line representatives made it seem like I would  
14 not have to do anything once I received my licenses -- like  
15 market my licenses or build out paging systems -- because  
16 operating paging companies would be contacting me with offers.

17 9. About a week and a half after the second phone call, a  
18 man identifying himself as "Don Neff" called. He told me he was  
19 the vice president of On Line. He convinced me to purchase a  
20 "growth city package" that he claimed was available for me. I  
21 agreed to go for licenses in: Orlando, FL; Atlanta, GA; Denver,  
22 CO; Dallas/Fort Worth, TX, for a total of \$37,970. At the  
23 insistence of Neff, I sent a wire transfer order in the amount of  
24 \$37,970 on 9/27/95 to the benefit of On Line to their Las Vegas  
25 Bank of America account. I have attached a true and correct copy  
26 of this wire transfer order as Exhibit 1.

1 10. After I paid the \$37,970, Neff called me again and  
2 convinced me to invest in a package of licenses for Miami and  
3 Fort Lauderdale, FL. I sent another wire transfer order to the  
4 Las Vegas account for \$12,500 on 10/10/95. I have attached a  
5 true and correct copy of this wire transfer order as Exhibit 2.

6 11. I asked Neff why On Line charged so much. He explained  
7 that On Line barely made any money on the deals because of the  
8 several engineering studies that needed to be conducted for each  
9 license and because of the complicated paper work that needed to  
10 be filled out correctly.

11 12. Through On Line's services, I received licenses for the  
12 following frequencies: 929.0625, 929.1625, 929.2625, 929.0875. I  
13 have not yet received all of the licenses for which On Line  
14 applied on my behalf. I have attached as Exhibit 3 true and  
15 correct copies of the licenses I have received plus application  
16 cards issued by the Personal Communications Industry Association  
17 reflecting the licenses I have not yet received.

18 13. To date, I have not received any offers to purchase or  
19 lease my licenses.

20 I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing  
21 is true and correct.

22  
23 Dated: December 23, 1995

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
 ung

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT ATTORNEY COPY  
PROCEEDINGS BEFORE

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

---

DKT/CASE NO.: 9623015

CIV NO.:

TITLE: Federal Trade Commission v.  
et al.

PLACE: New York, New York

DATE: March 11, 1996

PAGES: 1 through 182

Deposition of: - - -

---

**HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION**

*Official Reporters*  
1220 L Street, NW, Suite 600  
Washington, D.C.  
(202) 628-4888

EXHIBIT 23  
1



1 client.

2 Q Why was that?

3 A We understand that there can be overlapping  
4 applications on the 931 market area at which point the FCC  
5 will take one of two actions. They will not grant first  
6 come first serve basis. They will put it out for subsequent  
7 auction or non-competitive lottery. We did not feel that  
8 this was in the best interest of our clients. The only  
9 clients we put on 931s were those clients that specifically  
10 requested 931s.

11 Q I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 13,  
12 Mr. entitled on the top 152 MHZ VHF in  
13 parentheses. It's a one page document with some handwriting  
14 on it, typewritten with also some handwriting on it. Do you  
15 recognize Exhibit 13?

16 (Document above referred to  
17 was marked for identification  
18 as Exhibit 13.)

19 A Yes.

20 Q Do you recognize the handwriting?

21 A Most of the handwriting, yes.

22 Q And who's is that?

23 A Mine.

24 Q Is this the document that you received from  
25 Mr.

1 Q When you say guideline, what do you mean?

2 A We were of the belief that the FCC was eventually  
3 going to auction off all licenses which would have  
4 effectively put out of business.  
5 Somewhere along the course of my responsibility to search  
6 out new products, this one came to me and I thought it might  
7 be a good idea. So we setup a company. I wrote up some  
8 guidelines as to how to effectively handle the product as  
9 well as the clients. And this is basically a text of that  
10 guideline.

11 Q If I understand your testimony, you drafted  
12 Exhibit 18.

13 A Yes.

14 Q And subsequently had somebody type it?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Do you recognize any of the handwriting on it?

17 A No.

18 Q , was that a company that you  
19 incorporated?

20 A I incorporated

21 Q When?

22 A I don't remember, December '95, January of '96.

23 Q Did have offices? -

24 A It never got off the ground.

25 Q To whom did you give this Exhibit 18 as a

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

1 Q And when you say that you spoke with many license  
2 holders, were they license holders?

3 A Some.

4 Q What type of licenses did they have?

5 A Paging.

6 Q What type of paging?

7 A SMRs, 929s, 931s.

8 Q Are they shared licenses or exclusive licenses?

9 A I don't recall the details.

10 Q In Chadmore I believe you testified that you don't  
11 know what type of system they operate?

12 A No.

13 Q You don't know how big a system they operate?

14 A No.

15 Q Do you know if they ever paid any monies to Micom  
16 licensees for - for the use of those licenses?

17 A I know that they had contracts in place. I don't  
18 know if monies were submitted.

19 Q You testified on Monday that you believed that the  
20 licenses, that the paging licenses that was soliciting  
21 applications for had inherent value. Do you recall that  
22 testimony?

23 A Yes, sir. -

24 Q What do you mean by inherent value?

25 A They have value in and of themselves.

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

1           A     I don't believe that the government would put them  
2 out for public consumption if they were valueless. I don't  
3 believe that there would be mad scrambling of billions upon  
4 billions of dollars to the auctions if they had no value. I  
5 don't believe that knowledgeable investors such as Bill  
6 Gates would go after licenses without value. I'm a believer  
7 in scientific advancement.

8           Q     Let's talk about specifically shared-paging  
9 licenses. Do you believe the they're worth billions of  
10 dollars?

11          A     In the aggregate?

12          Q     No, individually.

13          A     I don't know that you would ever buy anything for  
14 billions of dollars.

15          Q     And shared-paging licenses, they are not issued  
16 through an auction are they?

17          A     I don't believe so.

18          Q     And you don't know, you don't know if Bill Gates  
19 owns any paging licenses do you?

20          A     I understood he acquired one at auction.

21          Q     A paging license?

22          A     That's what I understood.

23          Q     Who did you understand that from?     —

24          A     News reports.

25                     :    Would you have copies of those news

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT  
PROCEEDINGS BEFORE

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

DKT/CASE NO.: 9623015

CIV NO.:

TITLE: FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION v.

PLACE: Washington, D.C.

DATE: March 15, 1996

PAGES: 183 through 382

Deposition of:

---

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

*Official Reporters*

1220 I Street, NW, Suite 600



1           We had done some filings for our clients a few  
2 days before, and one of my engineers, one of my  
3 engineering subcontractors, contacted me on the next day  
4 and said, "Listen, last night at midnight the government  
5 froze the SMR program." It was obvious to both myself and  
6 that we were pretty much at the mercy of the FCC's  
7 decisions with regard to turns of events or the future of  
8 the business and we should scout out new products for  
9 and its clients.

10         Q.     What products were those?

11         A.     We had not come up with any particular  
12 products. Any specific products at that time.

13         Q.     In your mind, did you have a long future at  
14 doing what           was doing or were you looking for  
15 other opportunities?

16         A.     We had created           to be a  
17 long-lived entity. So obviously we were looking to do  
18 whatever we could reasonably do to maintain our existing  
19 client base, broaden our client base, and basically  
20 continue in the communications field.

21         Q.     What other opportunities were you looking at in  
22 December to go into if, for example, the government  
23 announced that it was going to shut down or freeze paging  
24 applications? Did you have an exit strategy?

25         A.     The first question would have been, well, what

FILED

06 JUN 2011 10:40

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARREN A. BOWIE  
DOUGLAS A. GORDIMER  
Federal Trade Commission  
6th St. and Penn. Ave., N.W.  
Room 200  
Washington, D.C. 20580  
(202) 326-2018, -3003

LINDA M. STOCK  
Federal Trade Commission  
11000 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 13209  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
(310) 235-7896

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

96- 0455 *kmw(SHx)*

Case No.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
BELL CONNECTIONS, INC.,  
JIMMIE JUSTUS, and  
MICHAEL BERMAN, d/b/a  
DISCOUNT FILING SERVICES,  
  
Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT  
OF PLAINTIFF FEDERAL TRADE  
COMMISSION'S EX PARTE  
APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER WITH  
ASSET FREEZE, APPOINTMENT  
OF TEMPORARY RECEIVER, ORDER  
FOR IMMEDIATE ACCESS,  
EXPEDITED DISCOVERY,  
AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
NOT ISSUE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II.	THE PARTIES . . . . .	4
III.	STATEMENT OF FACTS . . . . .	6
A.	The Paging Industry . . . . .	6
B.	Defendants' Marketing Practices . . . . .	8
C.	How Defendants Defraud the Public . . . . .	10
1.	<u>Defendants Misrepresent That Their Customers Are Likely To Earn Substantial Profit Or Income By Leasing Or Selling Licenses Obtained Through Defendants' Application Services</u> . . . . .	10
2.	<u>Defendants Misrepresent That Their Customers Will Derive Income Or Profit From Licenses Obtained Through Defendants' Application Services Without Constructing A Paging System Themselves</u> . . . . .	14
3.	<u>Defendants Misrepresent That No Entity Or Individual May Obtain Multiple Paging Licenses Directly From The FCC For Use In A Given Geographic Area</u> . . . . .	16
4.	<u>Defendants Misrepresent That An Investment In Defendants' License Application Services Is An Excellent Investment That Is Likely To Generate Substantial Profits</u> . . . . .	17
III.	ARGUMENT . . . . .	19
A.	This Court Has Authority To Grant The Requested Relief . . . . .	19
B.	The Commission Has Made The Showing Required For The Issuance Of A Temporary Restraining Order And Preliminary Injunction . . . . .	20
1.	<u>The Commission Has Shown A Substantial Likelihood Of Success On The Merits</u> . . . . .	22
a.	Defendants' Misrepresentations Violate the FTC Act . . . . .	22
b.	Individual Defendants Justus And Berman Are Also Liable . . . . .	23
c.	Fine Print Disclosure Cannot Excuse Defendants' Fraudulent Scheme . . . . .	24



2.	<u>The Balance Of Public Equities Mandates</u>	
	<u>Preliminary Injunctive Relief</u> . . . . .	25
C.	An Asset Freeze, Temporary Receiver For Defendant Bell, Immediate Access To Defendant Bell's Offices, And Expedited Discovery Are Necessary To Prevent Dissipation Of Assets And To Preserve The Possibility Of Effective Final Relief For Consumers . . . . .	26
D.	The Temporary Restraining Order Should Be Entered <u>Ex Parte</u> . . . . .	29
IV.	CONCLUSION . . . . .	32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<u>CEFC v. British American Commodity Options Corp.</u> , 560 F.2d 135 (2d Cir. 1977), <u>cert. denied</u> , 438 U.S. 905 (1978) . . . . .	21
<u>CEFC v. Co Petro Marketing Group, Inc.</u> , 680 F.2d 573 (9th Cir. 1982) . . . . .	27
<u>CEFC v. U.S. Metals Depository</u> , 468 F. Supp. 1149 (S.D.N.Y. 1979) . . . . .	25
<u>Chrysler Corp. V. ETC</u> , 561 F.2d 357 (D.C. Cir. 1977) . . . . .	25
<u>ESLIC v. Sahni</u> , 868 F 2d 1096 (9th Cir. 1989) . . . . .	27
<u>ETC v. American Fortune 900</u> , Civ. No. 96-305 RAP (RNBx) (C.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 1996) . . . . .	20
<u>ETC v. American Microtel</u> , No. CV-S-92-178-LDG (D. Nev. Dec. 23, 1993) . . . . .	1
<u>ETC v. American National Cellular</u> , 810 F.2d 1511 (9th Cir. 1987) . . . . .	1
<u>ETC v. American Standard Credit Systems, Inc.</u> , 874 F. Supp. 1080 (C.D. Calif. 1994) . . . . .	23
<u>ETC v. Amy Travel Service, Inc.</u> , 875 F.2d 563 (7th Cir.), <u>cert. denied</u> , 493 U.S. 954 (1989) . . . . .	23
<u>ETC v. Applied Telemedia</u> , No. 91-0635-CIV-Ungaro-Benages (S.D. Fla. Jan. 12, 1993) . . . . .	1
<u>ETC v. Atlantex Associates</u> , 1987-2 Trade Cas. (CCH) 67,788 (S.D. Fla. 1987), <u>aff'd</u> 872 F.2d 966 (11th Cir. 1989) . . . . .	25
<u>ETC v. Chase McNulty Group, Inc.</u> , No. 95-524-CIV-T-25E (M.D. Fla. Jan. 10, 1996) . . . . .	2
<u>ETC v. Digital Interactive Associates, Inc.</u> , No. 95- Z-754 (D. Colo. April 7, 1995) . . . . .	3
<u>ETC v. Digital Communications, Inc.</u> , No. 93-6648-JGD(JRX) . . . . .	1, 30
<u>ETC v. Evans Products Co.</u> , 775 F.2d 1084 (9th Cir. 1985) . . . . .	19
<u>ETC v. Goddard Rarities, Inc.</u> , Civ. No. 93-4602 (C.D.Cal. March 3, 1994) . . . . .	20
<u>ETC v. H.N. Singer, Inc.</u> , 668 F.2d 1107 (9th Cir. 1982) . . . . .	4, 19, 20, 28

1	<u>FTC v. Kitco of Nevada, Inc.</u> , 612 F. Supp. 1282 (D.Minn. 1985).	22
2	<u>FTC v. Magui Publishers, Inc.</u> , Civ. No. 89-3818 RSWL (GX) (C.D.Cal.	
3	June 26, 1989)	20
4	<u>FTC v. Metropolitan Communications, Corp.</u> , No. 94-Civ-0142	
5	(JFK)	1
6	<u>FTC v. Morgan Whitney Trading Group, Inc.</u> , Civ. No. 90-4887	
7	RSWL(Sx) (C.D. Cal Sept. 12, 1990).	20
8	<u>FTC v. NCH, Inc.</u> , 1995-2 Trade Cases (CCH) 71,114 at 75,351 (D.	
9	Nev. 1995)	23
10	<u>FTC v. Newport Gems, Inc.</u> , Civ. No. 90-2001R (C.D. Cal. April 25,	
11	1990)	20, 30
12	<u>FTC v. Pantron</u> , 33 F.3d 1088, 1103 (9th Cir. 1994)	23
13	<u>FTC v. Satellite Broadcasting Corporation</u> , SACV 95-336 LHM (Eex)	
14	(C.D. Cal. April 18, 1995)	20
15	<u>FTC v. Schoolhouse Coins, Inc.</u> , Civ. No. 87-05415 KN (TX) (C.D.	
16	Cal. Aug. 7, 1987)	20
17	<u>FTC v. Silueta Distributors, Inc.</u> , 1994 Dist. LEXIS 10095, *1	
18	(N.D. Cal. 1994)	29
19	<u>FTC v. Spectrum Resources Group, Inc.</u> , No. CV-N-695-HDM(RLH).	1
20	<u>FTC v. The Cellular Corp.</u> , No. C85-8231 (WHO) (N.D. Cal. Mar. 3,	
21	1986).	1
22	<u>FTC v. Thomsen-King &amp; Co.</u> , 109 F. 2d 516 (7th Cir. 1940)	22
23	<u>FTC v. Turcal, Inc.</u> , Civ No. 94-1398 AWT (Jgx) (C.D. Cal. Mar. 3,	
24	1994)	20
25	<u>FTC v. U.S. Oil &amp; Gas Corp.</u> , 748 F.2d 1431 (11th Cir. 1984).	
26		19, 20, 27
27	<u>FTC v. Warner Communications, Inc.</u> , 742 F.2d 1156 (9th Cir. 1984).	
28		21
	<u>FTC v. World Travel Vacation Brokers</u> , 861 F.2d 1020 (7th Cir.	
	1988)	22
	<u>FTC v. World Wide Classics, Inc.</u> , Civ. No. 92-3363 TJH (EEX) (C.D.	
	Cal. June 4, 1992)	20
	<u>FTC v. World Wide Factors, Ltd.</u> , 882 F.2d 344 (9th Cir. 1989)	
		21, 22, 23, 30

1	<u>Goodman v. FTC</u> , 244 F.2d 584 (9th Cir. 1957) . . . . .	22
2	<u>In re Rexplore, Inc. Securities Litigation</u> , 671 F. Supp. 679 (N.D. Cal. 1987) . . . . .	25
3	<u>In re Vuitton et Fils, S.A.</u> , 606 F.2d 1 (2d Cir. 1979) . . . . .	31
4	<u>Miller v. California Medical Cntr</u> , 19 F.3d 449 (9th Cir. 1994). . . . .	21
5	<u>National Society of Professional Engineers v. United States</u> , 435 U.S. 679 (1978) . . . . .	26
6	<u>Resort Car Rental System v. FTC</u> , 518 F.2d 962 (9th Cir.), <u>cert. denied</u> , 423 U.S. 827 (1975) . . . . .	22
7	<u>SEC v. Bowler</u> , 427 F.2d 190 (4th Cir. 1970) . . . . .	28
8	<u>SEC v. Capitol Counsellors, Inc.</u> , 332 F. Supp. 291 (S.D.N.Y. 1971). . . . .	28
9	<u>SEC v. Comcoa Ltd.</u> , 855 F. Supp. 1258 (S.D. Fla. 1994) . . . . .	25
10	<u>SEC v. Management Dynamics, Inc.</u> , 515 F.2d 801 (2d Cir. 1975) . . . . .	21
11	<u>SEC v. Manor Nursing Centers, Inc.</u> , 458 F.2d 1082 (2d Cir. 1972) . . . . .	26
12	<u>SEC v. R.J. Allen &amp; Associates, Inc.</u> , 386 F. Supp. 866 (S.D. Fla. 1974) . . . . .	26
13	<u>Southwest Sunsites, Inc.</u> , 106 F.T.C. 39 (1985), <u>affd</u> , 785 F.2d 1431 (9th Cir. 1986), <u>cert. denied</u> , 479 U.S. 828 (1986) . . . . .	25

## STATUTES

Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17511 <u>et seq</u> . . . . .	30
15 U.S.C. §41, <u>et seq.</u> . . . . .	passim

## MISCELLANEOUS

47 C.F.R. parts 90 and 22 . . . . .	7, 8, 15, 16
S. Rep. No. 130, 103rd Cong., 2d Sess. 15-16, <u>reprinted in</u> 1994 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 1776, 1790-91 . . . . .	29

1 I. INTRODUCTION

2 Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission ("FTC" or "Commission")  
3 brings this action to halt and redress defendants' violations of  
4 Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, ("FTC Act"), 15  
5 U.S.C. §45(a), which prohibits deceptive acts or practices in or  
6 affecting commerce. Defendants have violated Section 5 by  
7 fraudulent telemarketing application preparation services for,  
8 and investments in, paging licenses issued by the Federal  
9 Communications Commission ("FCC").

10 Investment schemes involving FCC licenses have proven to be  
11 popular among fraudulent telemarketers. The Commission has  
12 brought law enforcement actions against cellular phone license  
13 lottery scams,<sup>1</sup> wireless cable license application mills,<sup>2</sup>  
14 specialized mobile radio ("SMR") license application and build-  
15 out schemes,<sup>3</sup> and partnership frauds involving interactive  
16  
17  
18

---

19 <sup>1</sup> See, e.g., FTC v. American Nat'l Cellular, 810 F.2d 1511  
20 (9th Cir. 1987) (upholding preliminary injunction with asset  
21 freeze and appointment of receiver); FTC v. The Cellular Corp.,  
No. C85-8231(WHO) (N.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 1986) (stipulated permanent  
injunction).

22 <sup>2</sup> See, e.g., FTC v. Spectrum Resources Group, Inc., No. CV-  
23 N-695-HDM (RLH) (D. Nev. Feb. 28, 1995) (prevailed on merits at  
trial; permanent injunction, consumer redress and disgorgement  
24 ordered); FTC v. American Microtel, No. CV-S-92-178-LDG (D. Nev.  
Dec. 23, 1993) (stipulated permanent injunction and consumer  
25 redress ordered); FTC v. Applied Telemedia, No. 91-0635-CIV-  
Ungaro-Benages (S.D. Fla. Jan. 12, 1993) (stipulated permanent  
26 injunction and consumer redress ordered).

27 <sup>3</sup> See, e.g., FTC v. Digital Communications, Inc., No. 93-  
6648-JGD (JRX) (C.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 1995) (stipulated permanent  
28 injunction; summary judgment against one defendant); FTC v.  
Metropolitan Communications, Corp., No. 94-Civ-0142  
(JFK) (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 1994) (stipulated preliminary injunction  
entered; case is pending).

1 television licenses.<sup>4</sup> The latest in this long line of  
2 "information superhighway robbery," an investment scheme  
3 involving FCC paging licenses, has precipitated this action.

4 Through a nationwide telemarketing campaign, defendants sell  
5 paging license "application preparation services." Defendants  
6 charge consumers thousands of dollars to prepare and file  
7 applications for paging licenses with the FCC. Defendants tout  
8 such licenses as an excellent passive investment opportunity,  
9 telling consumers that they will reap thousands of dollars in  
10 profits, without additional expense or effort, by selling or  
11 leasing the licenses they obtain to large paging businesses.  
12 Defendants further claim that since paging carriers are  
13 prohibited from acquiring more than one license per geographic  
14 area from the FCC directly, they are more than willing to pay  
15 huge sums to buy or lease licenses from other licensees.

16 All of these claims are patently false. Rather than  
17 realizing phenomenal profits, consumers are likely to lose all of  
18 the money they invest with defendants. First, contrary to  
19 defendants' false claims, the FCC does not restrict paging  
20 operators from acquiring more than one license per geographic  
21 area -- such operators can, and do, obtain multiple licenses per  
22 area from the FCC. Second, paging carriers do not typically buy  
23 or lease bare licenses for undeveloped paging systems from  
24 individual consumers - they obtain licenses from the FCC

---

26 <sup>4</sup>FTC v. Chase McNulty Group, Inc., No. 95-524-CIV-T-25E  
27 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 10, 1996) (stipulated permanent injunction with  
28 permanent receiver and consumer redress filed), FTC v. Digital  
Interactive Associates, Inc., No. 95-Z-754 (D. Colo. April 7,  
1995) (preliminary injunction ordered; case is pending).

1 themselves, or they acquire operational paging systems from other  
2 paging carriers. Third, the FCC expressly prohibits the  
3 acquisition of paging licenses for the purpose of speculation or  
4 profitable resale. Licensees are expected to develop and operate  
5 paging systems themselves, and consumers who acquire licenses in  
6 violation of this policy risk forfeiture of their licenses. In  
7 sum, the licenses defendants tout as highly valuable and an  
8 excellent passive investment opportunity, in fact have little or  
9 no resale or investment value, and defendants have swindled  
10 consumers throughout the United States.

11 There is compelling evidence of defendants' fraudulent  
12 scheme, including transcripts of telemarketing sales pitches  
13 tape-recorded by undercover investigators, as well as  
14 declarations from defrauded consumers themselves. Declarations  
15 from the FCC, a paging industry expert, and representatives of  
16 the some of the largest paging companies in the nation  
17 conclusively prove the falsity of defendants' representations.  
18 The injury from defendants' scheme is large -- defendants' own  
19 documents show that they have taken in over \$4.5 million dollars  
20 from consumers. Absent action by this Court, their fraud will  
21 continue unabated, and potential redress for injured consumers  
22 will be squandered.

23 The Commission brings this ex parte application to obtain a  
24 temporary restraining order and asks this Court to (1) prohibit  
25 defendants from using deceptive practices in connection with the  
26 sale of FCC license application services; (2) freeze defendants'  
27 assets, (3) allow the Commission immediate access to relevant  
28 documents at defendants business premises, and allow for

1 expedited discovery as to the location of assets and documents;  
2 (4) appoint a temporary receiver over the corporate defendant;  
3 and (5) set a show cause hearing on why a preliminary injunction  
4 should not issue. This relief is critical to preserve assets for  
5 redress to injured consumers, secure key documents, and halt the  
6 ongoing fraud. As set forth below, there is extensive precedent  
7 within this Circuit and District to grant such relief in  
8 appropriate Commission actions.

## 10 II. THE PARTIES

11 Plaintiff **Federal Trade Commission** is an independent agency  
12 of the U.S. Government created by the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. §41 et  
13 seq. The Commission enforces, among other things, Section 5(a)  
14 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. §45(a), which prohibits deceptive acts  
15 or practices in or affecting commerce. Section 13(b) of the FTC  
16 Act, 15 U.S.C. §53(b), authorizes the Commission to file actions  
17 to enjoin FTC Act violations, and to secure the equitable relief  
18 appropriate in each case. See FTC v. H.N. Singer, Inc., 668 F.2d  
19 1107, 1111-1113 (9th Cir. 1982).

20 Defendant **Bell Connections, Inc.** ("Bell") is a California  
21 corporation with its principal places of business in Woodland  
22 Hills, California. (Ex. 11 at 385; Ex. 9 at 174). Defendant Bell  
23 has telemarketed application services for, and investment  
24 opportunities in, paging licenses since approximately April 1995,  
25 when it took over the operations of Discount Filing Services, a  
26  
27  
28



1 d/b/a of defendant Berman. (Ex. 11 at 386).<sup>5</sup> Bell income  
2 statements the Commission received from one Bell customer show  
3 that the company has taken in over \$4.5 million since 1994. (Ex.  
4 13 at 458-59).<sup>6</sup>

5 Bell has failed to comply with the California Telephonic  
6 Sellers Act, which requires all telephonic sellers of "any . . .  
7 investment opportunity of any type whatsoever" to register with  
8 the State of California, and most importantly, to post a bond in  
9 the amount of \$100,000 in favor of the State, for the benefit of  
10 any consumer harmed by violations of the Act. Violations of the  
11 Act are punishable by a fine of \$10,000 for each violation,  
12 and/or imprisonment for one year. Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17511  
13 et seq.; (Ex. 11 at 278).

14 Defendant **Jimmie Justus** ("Justus") is listed as the chief  
15 executive officer, chief financial officer, secretary, and sole  
16 director of defendant Bell on Bell's corporate filings. (Ex. 11  
17 at 385). Justus has also signed promotional letters to consumers  
18 as Bell's president. (Ex. 2 at 26; Ex. 6 at 153).

19 Defendant **Michael Berman** ("Berman") has done business as  
20 **Discount Filing Services** ("DFS"), a fictitious business  
21

---

22  
23 <sup>5</sup> In March 1995, one consumer was solicited by a  
24 representative of *Discount Filing Services*, and later noticed  
25 that Discount Filing Services had changed its name to Bell on  
26 promotional materials. (Ex. 8 at 157). Another consumer was  
solicited by a Bell representative in April 1995, (Ex. 6 at 104),  
suggesting that defendants started using Bell's name around April  
1995.

27 <sup>6</sup> These income statements were included with a letter to  
28 the Bell customer dated January 8, 1995 that stated that Bell was  
now "offering stock to [its] clients at the rate of \$1.00 per  
share (minimum 10,000 shares)." (Ex. 13 at 457).